

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 3-27 are currently pending, claim 27 being independent. Claims 3-7, 15-17 and 20-26 were withdrawn by the Examiner following an election in response to a Restriction Requirement. Claim 27 has been amended and is supported by original claim 3 and throughout the specification, for example, on page 11, lines 9-12, page 24, lines 22 to page 25, line 2 and FIGS. 1 and 13, which show that core member 11 and 51 are disposed in a lattice layout or zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in two or more directions in the position between the adjacent core members. Claims 8 and 18 have been amended in view of the amendment to independent claim 27. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank Examiner Alexander Thomas for discussing the amendment to claim 27 with Applicants representatives on March 8, 2010. In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable and the application should be passed to issue.

II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 11, 13, 14, 18 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tanimoto (JP 10-110887). Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, claim 27 has been amended, and now recites, in pertinent part, that the **“plurality of core members are disposed in a lattice layout or zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in two or more directions in the position between the adjacent core members.”** This configuration is shown, for example, in FIGS. 1 and 13. In FIG. 1, core members 11 are disposed in a lattice layout, that is, each side of the vertically and laterally adjacent core members 11 is nearly opposite and

parallel to each other, (see page 11, lines 10-12). FIG. 13 shows that the core members 51 are formed in a zigzag layout. That is, they are disposed at a specific interval so that core members 51 adjacent to each other in oblique 45-degree direction may be opposite to the oblique side, (see page 23, lines 22-24).

At a minimum, Tanimoto simply fails to teach or suggest a configuration in which a **plurality of core members are disposed in a lattice layout or zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in two or more directions in the position between the adjacent core members**, as recited in claim 27.

Therefore, it is clear that Tanimoto fails to disclose all of the elements of amended claim 27. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is allowable over the cited prior art references. Furthermore, claims 8-14, 18 and 19 depend from claim 27 and therefore are also allowable.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8-10 were rejected over Tanimoto in view of Miyoshi (JP 08-303686); claim 12 was rejected over Tanimoto in view of Stroobants (US 6,322,743) and claim 19 was rejected over Tanimoto. Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections.

However, as discussed above, claim 27 has been amended to expedite prosecution and now recites, in pertinent part, a **plurality of core members are disposed in a lattice layout or zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in two or more directions in the position between the adjacent core members**. Tanimoto does not teach or suggest such a configuration. Furthermore, none of Miyoshi or Stroobants teach or suggest a **plurality of core members are disposed in a lattice layout or zigzag layout at mutual**

specific intervals so as to form folding lines in two or more directions in the position between the adjacent core members, as recited in amended claim 27. As such, neither Miyoshi nor Stroobants cure the deficiencies in Tanimoto.

Furthermore, the configuration as recited in amended claim 27 achieves improved results that would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. For example, as explained on pages 26 and 27 of the specification, by disposing the core members in a lattice or a zigzag layout, the core member may be located in independent spaces individually, and therefore the vacuum heat insulator can be folded in four directions, and the limitation of shape of applicable objects is unexpectedly alleviated as compared with the conventional vacuum heat insulators, so that the applications are expanded.

Furthermore, because in the present invention, the degree of vacuum in the space of some core members is lowered, the degree of vacuum in the spaces of other core members is not lowered, and a drop of heat insulating performance can be kept to a minimum. Additionally, the configuration of the present inventions achieves easier patterning of the heat seal parts and easily reduces the size and simplifies the fusion device, and the fusion work is easier.

Thus, none of the cited prior art references teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 27 either alone or in combination. Furthermore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to modify the cited prior art references in such a manner as to arrive at the configuration of the present invention, because the present invention unexpectedly minimizes a drop in heat insulating performance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is allowable over the cited prior art references. Furthermore, claims 8-14, 18 and 19 depend from claim 27 and therefore are also allowable.

Application No.: 10/537,298

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:ASA:ajb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 16, 2010